



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,380	01/06/2006	Thomas James McArthur	9088SU	2136
20529	7590	08/14/2009		
THE NATH LAW GROUP 112 South West Street Alexandria, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
LEITH, PATRICIA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1655				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,380

Applicant(s)

MCARTHUR, THOMAS JAMES

Examiner

Patricia Leith

Art Unit

1655

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-14, 20, 22-42 and 47-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-42 and 47-62 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-14, 20, 22-32 and 63-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/7/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7, 12-14, 20, 22-42 and 47-67 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of the species of pawpaw and bicarbonate in the reply filed on 4/9/2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 33-42 and 47-62 are withdrawn from consideration on the merits as being directed toward a non-elected invention. It is noted that Applicants stated that claims 33-42 and 47-62 are canceled in their most recent reply; however, an amended claim set did not accompany Applicants' response. Until a time when an amended set of claims is entered which officially cancels claims 33-42 and 47-62; it will be taken that Applicants meant that claims 33-42 and 47-62 are withdrawn from consideration on the merits.

Claims 1-7, 12-14, 20, 22-32 and 63-67 were examined on their merits.

Applicants' amendments to the claims have overcome the previous rejections.

New rejections, as necessitated by Applicant's amendments to the claims are set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12-14 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in *Wands* states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to

make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case are discussed below.

It is clear that the pawpaw composition is an extract of the pawpaw fruit, which seems to closely resemble the juice of the pawpaw fruit. The juice is considered an 'extract' of the pawpaw fruit. It has not been demonstrated, in the Original disclosure, where an extract or fruit of pawpaw alone alleviated any wound as required by claims 12-14.

As an overview, Example 1 (A) is the pawpaw composition (p. 14, Specification).

The only examples in the specification which use the product of Example (1) alone are Example 18 (topical use for pain), Example 19(a) (topically for dry skin as a moisturizer), Example 19(b) (topical pain treatment) and Example 21 (topical, moisturizing).

The state of the art is unpredictable with regard to plant extracts was keenly provided in the previous Office action. The unpredictability of agents for treating wounds is equally unpredictable. Typically, to demonstrate the efficacy of a new wound healing agent; the agent should be capable of healing a wound more rapidly than the natural wound-healing process carried out in epithelial tissues. For example, such an agent would have the capability of augmenting the naturally-occurring wound healing process by mechanisms such as increasing epithelial cell growth or wound adhesion or collagen production. The Specification does not provide any evidence in the form of examples; nor does the Specification teach that the pawpaw products of the claims provide for any mechanism which would aid in wound healing.

The scope of the required enablement varies inversely with the degree of predictability involved, but even in unpredictable arts, a disclosure of every operable species is not required. A single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements. *In re Vickers*, 141 F.2d 522, 526-27, 61 USPQ 122, 127 (CCPA 1944); *In re Cook*, 439 F.2d 730, 734, 169 USPQ 298, 301 (CCPA 1971). However, in applications directed to inventions in arts where the results are unpredictable, the disclosure of a single species usually does not provide an adequate basis to support generic claims. *In re Soll*, 97 F.2d 623, 624, 38 USPQ 189, 191 (CCPA 1938). In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more may be required. *In re Fisher*,

427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity).

Absent any indication in the Instant specification that the pawpaw compositions will work for treating a wound; coupled with the fact that the state of the art does not recognize pawpaw fruit, or components thereof for treatment of wounds, the claimed invention is not enabled. Considering this evidence, the skilled artisan, lacking information with regard to pawpaw having the ability to treat a wound would necessarily need to perform tedious trial and error protocols without expectation of success.

Considering that there is no evidence that a composition of pawpaw will treat a wound, it follows that prophylactically treating a patient susceptible to the occurrence of sores with a composition of pawpaw fruit is also not enabled. Claim 14, is directed toward a prophylactic treatment; meaning the ability of the agent to prevent a sore from occurring. The enablement standard for prevention is even higher than the enablement standard for treatment; and absent any evidence that pawpaw fruit will treat a wound, and absent any medicinal factors which the skilled artisan could predictably extrapolate to prevention of a sore, the claim is not enabled.

In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970), held that:

"Inventor should be allowed to dominate future patentable inventions of others where those inventions were based in some way on his teachings, since such improvements while unobvious from his teachings, are still within his contribution, since improvement was made

possible by his work; however, **he must not be permitted to achieve this dominance by claims which are insufficiently supported and, hence, not in compliance with first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112; that paragraph requires that scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art;** in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, a single embodiment provides broad enablement in the sense that, once imagined, other embodiments can be made without difficulty and their performance characteristics predicted by resort to known scientific law; in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, scope of enablement varies inversely with degree of unpredictability of factors involved." (emphasis added)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6, 20, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt, L. WAY DOWN YONDER IN THE PAWPAW PATCH; Intelligencer Journal, Lancaster, Pa. Oct. 02 (1996) pg. C1, pp. 1-3 from ProQuest Database.

Claims 6, 20, 63 and 64 are directed toward products produced by the processes according to either claim 1 or claim 2. Claims 1 and 2 recite processes, and hence, claims 6, 20, 63 and 64 are all in product-by-process format. Since the methods of claims 1 and 2 recite 'comprising' language, the method may be carried out with additional, unrecited, undisclosed method steps.

Schmidt (1996) writing for the Intelligencer Journal reported several recipes made with pawpaw fruit including pawpaw bread made with 1 cup mashed ripe pawpaw fruit (with skin and seeds removed), 1 teaspoon of baking soda and melted margarine (see p. 2).

This bread is deemed to anticipate the composition claims for the following reasons:

Schmidt taught addition of 1 teaspoon of baking soda (sodium bicarbonate) to one cup mashed fruit. One making the bread of Schmidt, adding the baking soda directly to the cup of mashed fruit would have added about 2% of a base having a pKa of less than 11 (i.e., baking soda, also known as sodium bicarbonate). Because the composition claims are product-by-process and because the process uses open language; the process may additionally include addition of auxiliary ingredients as well as the baking steps included by Schmidt to make a pawpaw bread. While Schmidt did not beat (required by claims 63 and 64 which are dependent upon claim 4) the batter prepared for the bread, Schmidt did mix the batter. It is determined that mixing or beating would not have changed the final product to such an extent to render the product novel over Schmidt absent evidence to the contrary. There is no specific time for beating and hence, claim 4 is broad enough to read on beating for a few seconds or less. It is further determined that heating the pawpaw fruit to the temperatures required

by the claims prior to making the bread of Schmidt would not have changed the overall characteristics of the pawpaw bread.

Hence, Schmidt anticipated the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schmidt, L. WAY DOWN YONDER IN THE PAWPAW PATCH; Intelligencer Journal, Lancaster, Pa. Oct. 02 (1996) pg. C1, pp. 1-3 from ProQuest Database.

The teachings of Schmidt were discussed above. Schmidt did not teach the pH of the pawpaw bread. However, since the pawpaw bread contained many ingredients with a high pH, the bread probably has a pH within or 'about' 7.5 to about 9.5 absent evidence to the contrary. Further, the adjustment of pH of a food product would have been well-within the purview of the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made considering that pH is a result-effective variable. The ordinary artisan was well-aware of the palatability changes which took place upon adjustment of pH in food compositions and adjusting the pH of a food composition to suit varying tastes is deemed obvious lacking any unexpected result.

"As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972). The Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' composition differs and, if so, to what extent, from that of discussed references. Therefore, with the showing of the references, the burden of establishing non-obviousness by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-7, 12-14, 20, 22-32 and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard (1999) in view of Purdue University and Blackstone, R. A GIFT TO AVOID THE YULE BUDGET JAM; The Province, Vancouver, B.C. Nov. 17, 1993, pg. B 8, pp. 1-2 of ProQuest, (1993) and Schmidt, L. WAY DOWN YONDER IN THE PAWPAW PATCH; Intelligencer and Burckhardt, A. QUICK PICKLES AND JAMS; Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn; July 16, 1986; p. 03 T, pp. 1-6 of ProQuest Database.

Burchard, H. reporting for The Washington Post (1999) taught that pawpaw, known botanically as *Asimina triloba*, was an endogenous, fruit-bearing plant of the Eastern United states as well as Canada, often harvested for it's edible fruit as well as

the fruit's medicinal and insecticidal properties (see pp. 1-2). Burchard indicated pawpaw fruit to be used in various food items such as milkshakes, baked goods, pina coladas, pie, ice cream, chutney and brandy. Burchard specifically disclosed a recipe for pawpaw fruit jam which included combining pawpaw pulp, water, applesauce, apple juice, lime juice, sugar and pectin, stirring, bringing to a boil (100 °C), 'stirring constantly' and pouring into jelly jars (see entire reference, especially page 4).

Burchard did not specifically teach wherein pawpaw fruit jam was mixed with about 1 to 40% or 3-14% of a base having a pKa of less than 11 (Applicant's elected species is sodium bicarbonate), filtering, beating, freezing and thawing prior to filtering, wherein the fruit pulp was heated to about 40 °C to 70° from about 50° C to 60 °C.

Purdue University Online (PUO)(archived to 2001) teaches that pawpaw; known by its botanical name of *Asimina triloba*, was well known for its edible fruit; used as a food source containing larger amounts of vitamins, minerals, amino acids and food energy than apple, peach or grape (pp. 1-2). PUO reported that the pawpaw fruit are useful for making food products such as blended fruit drinks, baby food,, ice cream, puree and frozen food products. PUO additionally noted the cosmetic potential of the pawpaw fruit (p. 2).

Fruit jellies are often made with the addition of bicarbonates in order to strengthen the jelly compositions and to provide longer shelf-life according to

Wallerstein (US 1,997,616). Wallerstein teaches the addition of 1 part of magnesium carbonate (magnesium bicarbonate- MgCO_3) to 30 to 50 parts of pectin (see p. 1, col. 2). (pectin compositions are added to fruit/fruit juices to produce jellies and jams).

Blackstone, reporting for The Province. Vancouver, B.C.: Nov 17, 1993. pg. B.8, pp. 1-2 of ProQuest indicated that the fruit used in jams could be heated prior to addition of pectin and sugar; and thereby the fruit was heated prior to boiling (see p. 1).

Schmidt, L. reporting for the Intelligencer Journal of Lancaster, PA, reported several recipes using pawpaw fruit including a pawpaw bread and zabaglione and ice cream; wherein the seeds and peel were removed prior to use (see pp. 2-3).

Although the prior art does not specifically teach heating the fruit to the specific temperatures as required by claims 22-23 the ordinary artisan would have had a reasonable expectation that heating pawpaw to these temperatures would have enabled any additionally added sugar to dissolve into the pawpaw jelly/jam composition. Further, it is clear from the prior art that jams were prepared by first heating fruit at a temperature below boiling prior to boiling to dissolve the sugar and pectin into the fruit. Hence, the choice of temperature ranges as listed in claims 22 and 23 are deemed within the purview of the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made in order to

heat the fruit to homogenize the fruit mixture and could have been achieved through routine experimentation. It is clear that the prior art taught heating the fruit composition prior to making jams/jellies.

The ordinary artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing a pawpaw jam with the addition of a bicarbonate as taught by Wallerstein in order to increase the stability/shelf life of a pawpaw jelly or jam.

It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233; 235 (CCPA 1955). see MPEP § 2144.05 part II A. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicants' invention was made to determine all operable and optimal concentrations of bicarbonate, because this component was an art-recognized result-effective variable which would have been routinely determined and optimized in the food art. Further, if there are any differences between Applicant's claimed method and that suggested by the combined teaching of the prior art, the differences would be appear minor in nature.

Hence, the steps for producing the pawpaw composition as claimed is deemed obvious considering that pawpaw fruits are well-known in the art to be an edible fruit which is prepared into food compositions such as jams. The alterations of temperature

and amounts of bicarbonate in the claim are deemed within the level of the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made in order to vary these parameters under normal working conditions to prepare pawpaw jams and jellies: “[a] person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton *KSR* 127S. Ct. at 1742. Hence, absent any unexpected results, these variations are not deemed patentable over the prior art teachings.

With regard to claim 5 which states “wherein the mixture obtained in step (c) has a pH in the range of about 7.5 to about 9.5,” Applicant is directed to MPEP § 2111.04:

The determination of whether each of these clauses is a limitation in a claim depends on the specific facts of the case. In *Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.*, 405 F.3d 1326, 1329, 74 USPQ2d 1481, 1483 (Fed. Cir. 2005), the court held that when a “whereby” clause states a condition that is material to patentability, it cannot be ignored in order to change the substance of the invention.” *Id.* However, the court noted (quoting *Minton v. Nat’l Ass’n of Securities Dealers, Inc.*, 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003)) that a ***“whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited.”*** *Id.* < (emphasis added).

Hence, it follows from *Minton v. Nat’l Ass’n of Securities Dealers, Inc.*, 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) that claim 5 simply ‘expresses the intended result of a process step’ and is thus not given patentable weight.

KSR forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See the recent Board decision *Ex parte Smith*, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (citing KSR, 82 USPQ2d at 1396)

Clearly, Schmidt taught the removal of the skin and seeds. While Schmidt did not explicitly teach filtering or straining the seeds; the ordinary artisan would have been motivated to strain the fruit to remove the seeds for example prior to making a jam. Clearly, some prefer to use the pawpaw fruit without the seeds for making pawpaw food products. Hence, straining the fruits would have been a viable option for those wishing to remove the seeds of the fruit prior to making a jam or jelly from pawpaw fruit.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to freeze pawpaw fruit after harvesting in order to save it for a time prior to making jam; whereby the fruit would then be processed into a jam which could include the steps as recited by the claims. Clearly, freezing fruits and fruit juices was routine in the art of jam-making as indicated by Burckhardt.

Although the prior art did not expressly teach 'beating' the pawpaw fruit mixture to create a pawpaw jam; it is clear that Burchard (1999) stirred their mixture. The difference between beating and stirring is decidedly insignificant and hence, the

ordinary artisan would have recognized that beating could be substituted for mixing in the recipe of Burchard.

The Supreme court has acknowledged that:

When a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or a different one. **If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation..103 likely bars its patentability...**if a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill. A court must ask whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior-art elements according to their established functions...

...the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results (see *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 U.S. 2007) emphasis added.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia Leith whose telephone number is (571) 272-0968. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patricia Leith
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1655

/Patricia Leith/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655